

A STUDY ON WATER QUALITY AT SUNGAI PANDAN

MOHAMAD HAFIZUDDIN BIN MOHD
YUSRI

B. ENG(HONS.) CIVIL ENGINEERING

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG



STUDENT'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at Universiti Malaysia Pahang or any other institutions.

(Student's Signature)

Full Name : MOHAMAD HAFIZUDDIN BIN MOHD YUSRI

ID Number : AA15062

Date : 31st MAY 2019

A STUDY ON WATER QUALITY
AT SUNGAI PANDAN

MOHAMAD HAFIZUDDIN
BIN MOHD YUSRI

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the
B. Eng (Hons). Civil Engineering

Faculty of Civil Engineering & Earth Resources
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

MAY 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, I would like to thank to Allah SWT for giving me the strength and opportunity throughout in completing the research successfully. For my family who have supported me while I have been completing my research in terms of moral and finance. Especially my parents, Mohd Yusri Bin Abd Razak and Norhani Binti Md Isa, who always give me a motivation and inspiration during my study and convinced me to complete my research.

Next, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Puan Hasmanie Binti Abdul Halim for her guidance of my research, for her motivation and immense knowledge. Her effort to advise me in solving the problems either in laboratory works or writing thesis are invaluable. I am very fortunate to have benefited from the convergence of each of her unique expertise.

Then, I would like to thank to the staffs of FKASA Environmental Laboratory that have assist in my research analysis in need of materials, guideline and instructions during the laboratory works process of my research.

Last but not least, to the fellow presentation's panels of this project, thank you for the advices and recommendations given in making the project better. I appreciate all the advices and encouragement for everyone during the research.

ABSTRAK

Sungai mempunyai banyak kegunaan yang penting, adalah sangat penting untuk kualitinya dipantau dan dikaji secara berterusan. Justeru itu, objektif kajian ini adalah untuk menentukan Indeks Kualiti Air (WQI) Sungai Pandan berdasarkan enam parameter dalam skop Water Quality Index WQI, dan untuk melihat keberkesanan kaedah merawat air sungai dengan menggunakan dua jenis penggumpalan iaitu Aluminium Sulphat dan Iron Sulphate atau lebih dikenali sebagai Ferric Sulphate. Berdasarkan keputusan kajian, nilai WQI untuk Sungai Pandan adalah diantara 88.96 (hiliran) sehingga 97.62(hulu). Nilai ini diperoleh setelah mengambil kira sub-indeks enam parameter WQI iaitu Oksigen Terlarut (DO), Permintaan Oksigen Biokimia (BOD), Permintaan Oksigen Kimia (COD), Pepejal Terampai (TSS), Nitrogen Ammonia (AN) dan pH. Bagi penentuan klasifikasi Sungai Pandan, nilai WQI yang telah diperoleh menunjukkan Sungai Pandan berada di bawah Kelas I sehingga Kelas II. Untuk perbandingan kedua-dua penggumpalan, Aluminium Sulphate lebih bagus untuk penyingkiran kekeruhan and pepejal terampai. Peratus penyingkiran kekeruhan bagi Aluminium Sulphate di setiap stesen diantara 38.76% sehingga 60.98% manakala bagi Ferric Sulphate hanya diantara 21.14% sehingga 36.41% sahaja. Secara keseluruhan bagi penyingkiran kekeruhan dan pepejal terampai, Aluminium Sulphate lebih bagus berbanding Ferric Sulphate. Bagi penyingkiran pepejal terampai pula, untuk di setiap stesen peratus penyingkiran oleh Aluminium Sulphate adalah diantara 30.77% sehingga 48.48% dan ia adalah lebih tinggi berbanding Ferric Sulphate yang hanya diantara 12.5% sehingga 33.33% sahaja. Jelas kelihatan bahawa Aluminium Sulphate lebih bagus untuk menyingkirkan pepejal terampai berbanding Ferric Sulphate. Bagi penyingkiran logam-logam berat, Ferric Sulphate lebih menyerlah berbanding Aluminium Sulphate. Untuk logam Copper, Aluminium Sulphate telah menyingkirkan peratus logam diantara 5.88% sehingga 25% sahaja disetiap stesen manakala Ferric Sulphate bermula dari 17.65% sehingga 33.33%. Untuk logam Chromium, Aluminium Sulphate menyingkirkan sebanyak 10.34% sehingga 29.63% manakala Ferric Sulphate dapat menyingkirkan sebanyak 11.11% sehingga 37.63%. Untuk logam Zinc, 3.57% sehingga 56.25% bagi Aluminium Sulphate manakala 6.06% sehingga 59.38% dapat disingkirkan oleh Ferric Sulphate. Jelas ternyata bagi penyingkiran logam-logam berat Ferric Sulphate lebih bagus berbanding Aluminium Sulphate.

ABSTRACT

The river has many important uses, it is very important for its quality to be monitored and reviewed continuously. Therefore, the objective of this study is to determine the Water Quality Index (WQI) of Sungai Pandan based on the six parameters in the scope of the WQI Water Quality Index, and to see the effectiveness of the river water treatment method using two types of coagulants Aluminium Sulphate and Iron Sulphate or better known as Ferric Sulphate. Based on the results of the study, the WQI value for Sungai Pandan is between 88.96 (downstream) up to 97.62 (upstream). This value was obtained after taking into account the six sub-indexes of the WQI parameters: Dilute Oxygen (DO), Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD), Suspended Solids (TSS), Nitrogen Ammonia (AN) and pH. For the determination of the Pandan River classification, the WQI value has been shown to indicate that Pandan River is under Class I until Class II. For comparison of both coagulant, Aluminium Sulphate was better for removal of turbidity and suspended solids. The percentage of turbidity removal for Aluminium Sulphate at each station is between 38.76% and 60.98%, while for Ferric Sulphate is only between 21.14% and 36.41%. In general for the removal of turbidity and suspended solids, Aluminium Sulphate is better than Ferric Sulphate. For the removal of suspended solids, for each station the percentage of removal by Aluminium Sulphate is between 30.77% and 48.48% and it is higher than Ferric Sulphate which is only between 12.5% and 33.33%. It is clear that Aluminium Sulphate is better to remove suspended solids than Ferric Sulphate. For the removal of heavy metals, Ferric Sulphate is much superior to Aluminium Sulphate. For Copper, Aluminium Sulphate has removed metal percent between 5.88% and up to 25% at each station while Ferric Sulphate ranges from 17.65% to 33.33%. For Chromium metal, Aluminium Sulphate eliminates 10.34% up to 29.63% while Ferric Sulphate can get rid of 11.11% up to 37.63%. For Zinc metal, 3.57% to 56.25% for Aluminium Sulphate while 6.06% to 59.38% can be removed by Ferric Sulphate. Clearly, the removal of heavy metals Ferric Sulphate is better than Aluminium Sulphate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION

TITLE PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS I

ABSTRAK II

LIST OF TABLE VI

LIST OF FIGURES VIII

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS X

CHAPTER 1 1

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Background study 1

1.2 Problem statement 5

1.3 Objective study 6

1.4 Scope of study 6

1.5 Significant of study 7

CHAPTER 2 8

LITERATURE REVIEW 8

2.1 Introduction 8

2.2 Water Quality Index (WQI) 9

2.3 Coagulant (Aluminium and Iron Sulphate or Ferric Sulphate) 13

CHAPTER 3 16

METHODOLOGY 16

3.1 Introduction 16

3.2 Overall methodology process 17

3.2.1 Phase One 17

3.2.2 Phase Two 18

3.2.3 Phase Three	19
3.3 Sampling water surface	20
3.4 In-situ measurements	21
3.5 Ex-situ measurements	21
3.4.1 Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD)	21
3.4.2 Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	22
3.4.3 Ammonia Nitrogen (AN)	23
3.4.4 Total Suspended Solid (TSS)	24
3.6 Jar test	25
3.7 Heavy Metals	27
3.7.1 Copper	27
3.7.2 Chromium	28
3.7.3 Zinc	29
CHAPTER 4	30
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	30
4.1 Introduction	30
4.2 Water Quality Index (WQI)	31
4.3 Jar Test	36
4.4 Total Suspended Solids	54
4.5 Heavy Metals	58
CHAPTER 5	60
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	60
5.1 Conclusion	60
5.2 Recommendation	61
REFERENCES	62

LIST OF TABLE

Table 1.1	National Quality Water Standard (NQWS) Malaysia	3
Table 1.2	Water Quality Classification	4
Table 1.3	WQI Table	4
Table 3.1	Coordinate for each station	20
Table 4.1	Up-stream parameter	31
Table 4.2	Middle-stream parameter	32
Table 4.3	Down-stream parameter	33
Table 4.4	Formulae of conversion for sub-index	34
Table 4.5	Sub-index	34
Table 4.6	Classification of WQI	35
Table 4.7	Jar test up-stream A	36
Table 4.8	Jar test up-stream B	38
Table 4.9	Jar test up-stream C	40
Table 4.10	Jar test middle-stream A	42
Table 4.11	Jar test middle-stream B	44
Table 4.12	Jar test middle-stream C	46
Table 4.13	Jar test down-stream A	48
Table 4.14	Jar test down-stream B	50
Table 4.15	Jar test down-stream C	52
Table 4.16	TSS result for up-stream	54
Table 4.17	TSS result for up-stream after using Aluminium Sulphate	54
Table 4.18	TSS result for up-stream after using Ferric Sulphate	54
Table 4.19	TSS result for middle-stream	55

Table 4.20	TSS result for middle-stream after using Aluminium Sulphate	55
Table 4.21	TSS result for middle-stream after using Ferric Sulphate	55
Table 4.22	TSS result for down-stream	56
Table 4.23	TSS result for down-stream after using Aluminium Sulphate	56
Table 4.24	TSS result for down-stream after using Ferric Sulphate	56
Table 4.25	Average comparison	57
Table 4.26	Percentage of removal (%)	57
Table 4.27	Heavy metals results for up-stream	58
Table 4.28	Heavy metals results for middle-stream	58
Table 4.29	Heavy metals results for down-stream	59

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1	Phase One	17
Figure 3.2	Phase Two	18
Figure 3.3	Phase Three	19
Figure 3.4	Location of each checkpoint	20
Figure 3.5	Dissolve oxygen meter	21
Figure 3.6	Incubator	22
Figure 3.7	DR 6000 spectrophotometer	22
Figure 3.8	Result of AN obtain by using DR 5000 spectrophotometer	23
Figure 3.9	TSS apparatus	24
Figure 3.10	Result of weight of filter paper by using Balance GR200	24
Figure 3.11	Universal oven	25
Figure 3.12	Jar test apparatus	26
Figure 3.13	CuVer1 Copper Reagents Powder Pillow	27
Figure 3.14	ChromaVer3 Chromium Reagents Powder Pillow	28
Figure 3.15	ZincoVer5 Zinc Reagents Powder Pillow	29
Figure 4.1	Up-stream A Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	36
Figure 4.2	Up-stream A Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	37
Figure 4.3	Up-stream B Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	38
Figure 4.4	Up-stream B Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	39
Figure 4.5	Up-stream C Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	40

Figure 4.6	Up-stream C Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	41
Figure 4.7	Middle-stream A Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	42
Figure 4.8	Middle-stream A Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	43
Figure 4.9	Middle-stream B Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	44
Figure 4.10	Middle-stream B Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	45
Figure 4.11	Middle-stream C Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	46
Figure 4.12	Middle-stream C Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	47
Figure 4.13	Down-stream A Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	48
Figure 4.14	Down-stream A Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	49
Figure 4.15	Down-stream B Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	50
Figure 4.16	Down-stream B Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	51
Figure 4.17	Down-stream C Turbidity vs Dosage for Aluminium Sulphate	52
Figure 4.18	Down-stream C Turbidity vs Dosage for Ferric Sulphate	53

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

WQI	Water Quality Index
NQWS	National Quality Water Standard
DO	Dissolve Oxygen
BOD	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
AN	Ammonia Nitrogen
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
pH	Acidity/Alkalinity

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background study

‘Water Planet’ also other name for the Earth. By far most of water on the Earth surface is more than 96 percent, is saline water in the seas. The freshwater assets, for example, water tumbling from the skies and moving into streams, waterways, lakes, and groundwater, give individuals the water they require each day to live. Water sitting on the surface of the Earth is anything but difficult to imagine, and your perspective of the water cycle may be that precipitation tops off the waterways and lakes.

Surface water assets, for example, streams, lakes, repositories, estuaries, and beach front waters, are fundamental for sea-going biological communities, water supply, fisheries, and recreational and shipping exercises. For quite a long time, they have been viewed as the premise of improvement for urban zones, industry, and farming far and wide. Consequently, fitting preservation and the board of surface water assets is vital.

Waterways as a rule of a wide range of qualities to various individuals. For instance, waterways symbolize associations, since they contact everybody, and everyone on a fundamental level lives downstream. Streams additionally symbolize human well-being, since crisp water from waterways is fundamental to our networks and ourselves. Another esteem exemplified in a waterway is that of living space, featuring the significance of securing freshwater biological communities for fish and untamed life both in the stream, and along the river banks.

Deforestation in watershed area can prompt soil disintegration, which expands the danger of flooding and avalanches, and in addition making the soil unusable for farming or family unit purposes. Along a streams course, networks living along the river banks are in charge of an alternate arrangement of issues that further influence water quality and amount - over use, dumping of strong waste, depleting of sewage and dark water, and urban trash that dirties water run-off that streams into waterways. Ventures add to these issues by releasing waste water, synthetic compounds and so forth specifically into waterways, without being securely treated heretofore. At the point when dirtied waterways deplete into seas, the issues are intensified, contamination influences angle stocks, wrecks coral-reef living spaces that further exhausts angle stocks, and builds marine squanders, especially plastics, entering the natural way of life and in the end influencing human when animals devour the plastics. Waterways are in reality confronting various natural issues. This is in spite of the way that the greater part of consumable water for human utilization originates from waterways. In some outrageous cases, waterways, lakes and estuaries are unsatisfactory for such essential uses as angling and swimming.

Waterways convey water and supplements to regions all around the earth. Stream have a significant impact in the water cycle, going about as seepage channels for surface water. Rivers give fantastic environment and sustenance to a significant number of the world organisms. Many uncommon plants and trees develop by waterways. Ducks, voles, otters and beavers make a homes on the stream banks. Reeds and different plants like bulrushes develop along the stream banks. Other creatures utilize the waterway for sustenance and drink. Fowls, for example, kingfishers eat little fish from the waterway. In Africa, creatures, for example, elands, lions and elephants go to waterways for water to drink. Different creatures, for example, bears get fish from rivers. River deltas have various types of natural life. Creepy crawlies, warm blooded animals and feathered creatures utilize the delta for homes and for food. Rivers give venture out courses to investigation, business and recreation. River valleys and fields give ripe soils. Ranchers in dry locales inundate their cropland utilizing water conveyed by water system trench from adjacent rivers. Rivers are a significant vitality source. Amid the early mechanical period, plants, shops, and manufacturing plants were worked close quick streaming waterways where water could be utilized to control machines. Today steep waterways are as yet used to control hydroelectric plants and water turbines.

With an end goal to build up a framework to think about water quality in different parts of the nation, more than 100 water quality specialists were called upon to help make a standard Water Quality Index (WQI). The record is fundamentally a scientific method for ascertaining a solitary incentive from numerous test outcomes. The file result speaks to the dimension of water quality in a given water bowl, for example, a lake, waterway, or stream. The important is imperative to screen water quality over some undefined time frame so as to distinguish changes in the water biological system. The Water Quality Index, which was produced in the mid-1970s, can give a sign of the soundness of the watershed at different indicates and can be utilized monitor and examine changes after some time. The WQI can be utilized to screen water quality changes in a specific water supply after some time, or WQI very well may be utilized to contrast a water supply quality and other water supplies in the locale or from around the globe.

The Water Quality Index utilizes a scale from 0 to 100 to rate the nature of the water, with 100 being the most noteworthy conceivable score. When the general WQI score is known, WQI very well may be contrasted against the accompanying scale with decide how solid the water is on a given day.

Table 1.1 National Water Quality Standards (NWQS) Malaysia

Parameter	Unit	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V
Nitrogen Ammonia	mg/L	<0.1	0.1-0.3	0.3-0.9	0.9-2.7	>2.7
Biochemical Oxygen Demand	mg/L	<1	1-3	3-6	6-12	>12
Chemical Oxygen Demand	mg/L	<10	10-25	25-50	50-100	>100
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	>7	5-7	3-5	1-3	<1
pH	-	>7	6-7	5-6	<5	>5
Suspended solids	mg/L	<25	25-50	50-150	150-300	>300
Water Quality Index	-	<92.5	76.5- 92.7	51.9- 76.5	31.0- 51.9	>31.0

REFERENCES

- Dom, R., Gonz, T., Garc, H. M., & Francisco, S. (2007). Aluminium sulfate as coagulant for highly polluted cork processing wastewaters : Removal of organic matter, *148*, 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2007.05.003>
- Ewaid, S. H., & Abed, S. A. (2017). Water quality index for Al-Gharraf River, southern Iraq. *Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Research*, *43*(2), 117–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejar.2017.03.001>
- Guo, B., Yu, H., Gao, B., Rong, H., Dong, H., Ma, D., & Li, R. (2015). Colloids and Surfaces A : Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects Coagulation performance and floc characteristics of aluminum sulfate with cationic polyamidine as coagulant aid for kaolin-humic acid treatment. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects*, *481*, 476–484. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2015.06.017>
- He, W., Xie, Z., Lu, W., Huang, M., & Ma, J. (2019). Separation and Purification Technology Comparative analysis on floc growth behaviors during ballasted flocculation by using aluminum sulphate (AS) and polyaluminum chloride (PACl) as coagulants. *Separation and Purification Technology*, *213*(September 2018), 176–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2018.12.043>
- Hou, W., Sun, S., Wang, M., Li, X., Zhang, N., Xin, X., ... Jia, R. (2016). Assessing water quality of five typical reservoirs in lower reaches of Yellow River, China: Using a water quality index method. *Ecological Indicators*, *61*, 309–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.09.030>
- Lin, J., Couperthwaite, S. J., & Millar, G. J. (2017). Effectiveness of aluminium based coagulants for pre-treatment of coal seam water. *Separation and Purification Technology*, *177*, 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2017.01.010>
- Llor, M., Soler, A., & Ortu, J. F. (2003). Microscopic observation of particle reduction in slaughterhouse wastewater by coagulation – flocculation using ferric sulphate as coagulant and different coagulant aids, *37*, 2233–2241.
- Misaghi, F., Delgosha, F., Razzaghmanesh, M., & Myers, B. (2017). Introducing a water quality index for assessing water for irrigation purposes: A case study of the Ghezel Ozan River. *Science of the Total Environment*, *589*, 107–116.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.02.226>

- Nishat, S., Rajapakse, J., Dawes, L. A., & Millar, G. J. (2018). Journal of Water Process Engineering Coagulants for removal of turbidity and dissolved species from coal seam gas associated water. *Journal of Water Process Engineering*, 26(August), 187–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2018.10.017>
- Ponsadailakshmi, S., Sankari, S. G., Prasanna, S. M., & Madhurambal, G. (2018). Evaluation of water quality suitability for drinking using drinking water quality index in Nagapattinam district, Tamil Nadu in Southern India. *Groundwater for Sustainable Development*, 6(October 2017), 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gsd.2017.10.005>
- Tomas, D., Čurlin, M., & Marić, A. S. (2017). Assessing the surface water status in Pannonian ecoregion by the water quality index model. *Ecological Indicators*, 79(April), 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.04.033>
- Tripathi, M., & Singal, S. K. (2019). Use of Principal Component Analysis for parameter selection for development of a novel Water Quality Index: A case study of river Ganga India. *Ecological Indicators*, 96(May 2018), 430–436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.09.025>
- Umar, M., Roddick, F., & Fan, L. (2018). Comparison of coagulation efficiency of aluminium and ferric-based coagulants as pre-treatment for UVC / H₂O₂ treatment of wastewater RO concentrate. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 284(2016), 841–849. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2015.08.109>
- Wu, Z., Wang, X., Chen, Y., Cai, Y., & Deng, J. (2018). Assessing river water quality using water quality index in Lake Taihu Basin, China. *Science of the Total Environment*, 612, 914–922. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.08.293>
- Chaturvedi, M.K., Bassin, J.K., 2009. Assessing the water quality index of water treatment plant and bore wells, in Delhi, India. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 163 (1/4), 449–453.
- Debels, P., Figueroa, R., Urrutia, R., Barra, R., Niell, X., 2005. Evaluation of water quality in the Chilla'n river (Central Chile) using physicochemical parameters and a modified water quality index. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 110, 301–322.

- S. Al-Asheh, A. Aidan, Operating conditions of coagulation-flocculation process for high turbidity ceramic wastewater, *Water Environ. Nanotechnol.* 2 (2017) 80–87, <http://dx.doi.org/10.22090/jwent.2017.02.002>.
- J. Beltrán-Heredia, J. Sánchez-Martín, M. Barrado-Moreno, Long-chain anionic surfactants in aqueous solution. Removal by *Moringa oleifera* coagulant, *Chem. Eng. J.* 180 (2012) 128–136, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2011.11.024>.
- N. Graham, G. Fang, F. Geoffrey, W. Mark, Characterization and coagulation performance of a tannin-based cationic polymer: a preliminary assessment, *Colloids Surf. A: Physicochem. Eng. Aspects* 3 (2008) 9–16.
- N.M.G. Fernandes, P.G. Yovanka, H.T.R. Rosely, S.B. Cristina, Influência do pH de coagulação e da dose de sulfato de alumínio na remoção de oocistos de *Cryptosporidium* por filtração direta descendente, *Eng. Sanit. Ambien.* 15 (2010) 375–384, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-41522010000400010>.